



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

**Doyle, John A.** *English Colonies in America*. Volume IV, The Middle Colonies; Volume V, The Colonies under the House of Hanover. Pp. xxxii, 944. Price, \$3.50. New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1907.

The appearance of the final volumes of Mr. Doyle's history of the English colonies in America marks the completion of a work the first volume of which was issued a quarter of a century ago. The author's death, following within a few months of the publication, awakens a peculiar interest in these volumes and naturally suggests a brief résumé of his work on American history. Probably no Englishman of his generation has evinced greater interest in American colonial history or written so extensively in this field. His earliest work, the Arnold prize essay at Oxford dates back to 1869. In addition to his chief work, and his frequent notes and reviews of books on American history in the *English Historical Review*, his most notable contribution is the chapter in the seventh volume of the "Cambridge Modern History" on the American colonies. It would appear, however, that Mr. Doyle pursued historical work as an avocation, a mere incident of his life as a gentleman farmer and sportsman.

Of his earlier volumes in this series, the first was devoted to the Southern colonies from their settlement to the close of the reign of Queen Anne, and the second and third to the New England colonies during the same period. While his pages were frequently marred by minor errors, in general his narrative was regarded as trustworthy and as presenting in the main a true picture of the times.

Finally, after an interval of more than twenty years, a period so long in fact, that it was supposed by many that Mr. Doyle had permanently abandoned his task, the concluding volumes were finished. The student of colonial history will be curious to note whether the new volumes reveal a more mature scholarship and a firmer grasp upon his subject.

It may be said at the outset that Mr. Doyle has followed the same general plan as in his earlier volumes. In Volume IV the Middle Colonies are treated up to 1714, in conformity with his history of the Southern and New England Colonies. Six chapters of this volume, or about two-thirds of its contents, are devoted to New York, two to New Jersey and a single inadequate chapter is allotted to Pennsylvania. The final volume covers the colonies under the House of Hanover from 1714 to 1760. Here, instead of adhering to a continuous narrative of the colonies according to their geographical grouping, Mr. Doyle essays to consider the colonies as a whole, treating their history topically in chapters dealing with special subjects, such as the general condition of the colonies at the opening of the period, their administration, their economic progress, their religious, literary and educational development. The volume concludes with a careful account of the colonization of Georgia and a summary of the events of the French and Indian War.

While Mr. Doyle's treatment of the Middle Colonies is fairly systematic, it follows traditional lines and is not based in all cases on the latest authorities. Its proportion is open to criticism, and like the early volumes, the strict adherence to a geographical classification precludes any scientific or

thoroughgoing comparison and study of colonial institutions, so necessary to an understanding of later American constitutional history.

The final volume is the least satisfactory of the set. In his attempt to treat the colonies as a whole the author fails to acquire a continental grasp, and contents himself with a topical narrative along conventional lines which at best is very incomplete. One especially misses any systematic account of the development of British imperial policy and the administrative control of the colonies. To illustrate, there is no adequate discussion of the navigation acts, or the commercial policy of Great Britain. The functions and manifold activities of the board of trade are not presented. The increasing interference of Parliament and the executive department of the British government in the internal affairs of the colonies is not sufficiently brought out. Narratives of the conflicts between the colonial legislature and the royal and proprietary governors are given, but there is no clear presentation of the general policy of the imperial government. This neglect is the more surprising and disappointing in view of the emphasis which has been placed upon these phases of colonial history by recent American authors.

It is apparent that these obvious omissions are due in part to Mr. Doyle's adherence to the older view of the scope of colonial history. His source material while good, has been inadequate. He has relied upon the older standard histories, such as Broadhead's *New York* and Proud's *Pennsylvania*, together with the published records of the several colonies, and to a limited extent upon the printed volumes of the *Calendar of State Papers*, but only in rare instances has he consulted manuscript archives.

In addition to other shortcomings the author's work is marred by a decided inaccuracy of detail. There are also many instances of carelessness and lack of consistency in the citation of references in the footnotes. A few examples of some of the most conspicuous of these errors must suffice. American geography, so troublesome to English writers in general, has proved to be none the less so in this case. Thus we are informed that the Piscataqua separates New Hampshire from Massachusetts; that Onondaga county is the district which is now Vermont, that the New York-Connecticut boundary line lies twenty miles north of the Hudson, that Flatbush is at the southeast end of Long Island, that Elizabethtown is located on the Delaware. New Netherland is invariably spelled New Netherlands. The celebrated Philadelphia lawyer, Andrew Hamilton, is referred to as Alexander Hamilton; and Jonathan Belcher is incorrectly named Andrew. To the colony of New York is erroneously given the credit of having first asserted the right of self-taxation. The Pennsylvania Charter of Privileges of 1701, we are told, made no modification of any constitutional importance, although in fact it changed the whole status and character of the council in its relation to the assembly.

With all their shortcomings these volumes possess many redeeming qualities. They contain a readable narrative of facts, impartially presented and frequently enriched by well considered judgments and reflections. Mr. Doyle has been happy in his characterization of men, as instanced in his realistic pen portrait of Stuyvesant and his sympathetic estimate of Penn.

Viewed as a whole these volumes present an essentially truthful, although not a complete, account of the internal development of the colonies. Their chief deficiency is in their failure to adequately present their history in relation to the rest of the empire. The final judgments of Mr. Doyle's history, we believe, will pronounce it a highly useful but not a scientific and indispensable work.

HERMAN V. AMES.

*University of Pennsylvania.*

---

**McBain, H. L.** *DeWitt Clinton and the Origin of the Spoils System in New York.* Pp. 161. Price, \$1.50. New York: Macmillan Company, 1907.

The name of DeWitt Clinton is usually connected with all that is debasing and corrupt in the distribution of patronage in New York. With his advent to power in the politics of his state by the turn of fortune in 1801, he is charged with cleaning all the offices of federalists to make way for republicans, that for his own self-interest the adherents of rivals within his own party were excluded, and that he was guilty of nepotism. From such imputations it is the express purpose of this paper to clear the name of DeWitt Clinton. It is a curious fact that at least half a dozen scholars and historians of eminence and ability have uttered these charges without any regard to the story the source material might tell. And this source material has not been inaccessible.

This monograph is based on the manuscript files and minutes of the council of appointment in whose hands lay the patronage of New York, also on the public papers of both George and DeWitt Clinton, on the legislative journals with a judicious use of contemporary newspapers and pamphlets. To show what precedent there was, and to what extent DeWitt Clinton departed from precedent, an account is given not only of the history of civil service in the state prior to 1801, but also in the national government.

The writer clearly shows by adequate evidence that in both state and nation "every feature of DeWitt Clinton's plan of parceling out the patronage of the state found some authority in the practice which had preceded him" (p. 13). In New York State the federalist council of appointment under Governor George Clinton practiced a policy of exclusion toward opponents and a similar policy was adopted when the federalists rose to power under Jay in 1795. In 1801 the republicans were victorious in both state and national elections only to find all the offices in the hands of their political opponents. It was inevitable that with a change of party should come a change in office holding. DeWitt Clinton practiced no new system in using the patronage for party ends. It had been an inveterate practice of English politics.

Further, the evidence plainly shows that DeWitt Clinton did not exclude all political opponents. His policy was to grant the larger offices to republicans, and to divide the smaller between the parties in proportion to their respective numbers, and this plan was put into practice. Neither did he exclude the adherents of Burr, but places were found for some of this rival's closest adherents. On the charge of nepotism it is curious to note